

REMARKS

The Examiner has maintained his rejection of claims 1-3, 8-9, and 12-30 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art of the Triad system, in view of Ratnerej *et al.* However, in his "Response To Arguments" section, the Examiner indicated that "if applicant amends the claims to include the elements being argued, the current rejection may not be proper." The "elements being argued" are described as comprising Applicant's assertion that the "invention interacts with the central data center such that one could use and reuse in the future." From the foregoing, it appears that the Examiner's objection is to the Applicant's characterizing the invention as having a client that is "adapted for" "exchanging information."

To remedy this and thereby make the distinction between the claimed invention and the prior art clearer, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 25, 26, 27, and 29. Each of the independent claims are similarly amended, although some variations appear in the language. However, the essence of the amendments is the same for each of the independent claims. Claim 1 is representative.

In Claim 1, applicant describes: "an end user client comprising a facility embodied in a personal computer platform for interaction with said central data center to exchange information between said central data center and said client via said secure internet Website, to manage database files and control settings for uploading to a host system from said client for processing, and to execute applications at said client which comprise a graphible front-end for graphible views of strategy, strategic portfolios siience, and scorecard data..."

Such client is not known from the art. Applicant has made every effort to amend the claim language, consistent with the Examiner's remarks, such that the current rejection may be overcome. Applicant appreciates any additional guidance the

Examiner may have to offer. It should be appreciated that it has never been Applicant's intent that amendments should otherwise limit the scope of the claims. Applicant does not consider any claimable or potentially claimable subject matter to have been surrendered by this amendment. Nor does the Applicant acknowledge the propriety of the current rejection. Rather, Applicant is of the opinion that the amendments herein comport with the Examiner's remarks and has provided these amendments in a good faith attempt to place the claims in allowable condition, consistent with the concerns legitimately raised by the Examiner.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully Submitted,


Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862